

REMARKS

Claims 69-81 are pending in this application. Claim 69 has been amended in this response.

In the Final Office Action dated November 10, 2004, claims 69-81 were rejected. More specifically, the status of the application in light of this Office Action is as follows:

(A) Claims 69-76 and 78-81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,496,755 to Bayraktaroglu ("Bayraktaroglu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,374,564 to Bruel ("Bruel"); and

(B) Claim 77 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayraktaroglu and Bruel in view of Wolf and Tauber (Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era, Volume 1: Process Technology) ("Wolf").

The undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone conference on February 7, 2005, and requests that this paper constitute the applicants' Interview Summary. During that telephone conference, the present Office Action, Bayraktaroglu, Bruel, and a proposed amendment to claim 69 were discussed. The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendment patentably distinguishes claim 69 over Bayraktaroglu and Bruel. Claim 69 has been amended accordingly.

A. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection of Claims 69-76 and 78-81

Claims 69-76 and 78-81 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayraktaroglu in view of Bruel. In light of the agreement reached during the February 7 telephone conference, the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 69 will be withdrawn.

Claims 70-76 and 78-81 depend from claim 69. Accordingly, the Section 103(a) rejection of these claims should be withdrawn for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 69 and for the additional features of these claims.

B. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection of Claim 77

Claim 77 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayraktaroglu and Bruel in view of Wolf. Claim 77 depends from claim 69. Wolf fails to cure the deficiency of Bayraktaroglu and Bruel as references supporting a *prima facie* case of obviousness. More specifically, Wolf does not provide a way for Bruel's method to be used to form Bayraktaroglu's device such that the modified device would include all the features of claim 77. Accordingly, the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 77 should be withdrawn.

C. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the claims pending in the application comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and patentably define over the applied art. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-6465.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP



David T. Dutcher
Registration No. 51,638

Date: Feb. 9, 2005

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000